



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CONFLICT OF LAWS — TESTAMENTARY SUCCESSION — PRIVITY BETWEEN DIFFERENT REPRESENTATIVES OF SAME DECEDENT. — The plaintiff obtained a judgment on a note made by the decedent against the domiciliary executor in Michigan. He then brought an action on this judgment against the administrator *cum testamento annexo* of the same decedent in California, after the original claim was barred by the short statute of limitations. *Held*, that the Michigan judgment is not only not the basis of an action, but is not even evidence against the California administrator. *Richards v. Blaisdell*, 106 Pac. 732 (Cal., Ct. App.).

Where a decedent leaves property in several states, authority to deal with it must be obtained from the sovereign of the *situs*, and letters testamentary have no legal force beyond the territorial jurisdiction of such sovereign. *Dixon v. Ramsey*, 3 Cranch (U. S.) 319. Since the property in each state is thus treated as an independent estate, the doctrine of the principal case that a judgment against one representative is not evidence against another in a different state, is in accordance with authority and principle. *Stacy v. Thrasher*, 6 How. (U. S.) 44. It is applied though the same person is administrator in both states. *Johnson v. Johnson*, 63 Hun (N. Y.) 1. A distinction is made in case a testator has appointed two executors in different states. *Hill v. Tucker*, 13 How. (U. S.) 458. See *Garland v. Garland*, 84 Va. 181; *Carpenter v. Strange*, 141 U. S. 87. It is said that there is privity between such executors, for while the authority of administrators rests solely upon appointment by a court of probate, the authority of executors is derived from the testator through the will. The distinction seems unsound, for neither the executor nor the administrator has power to act until the probate court has granted letters testamentary or letters of administration. See *Dixon v. Ramsey, supra*.

CONSPIRACY — CRIMINAL LIABILITY — INDEMNIFICATION OF CRIMINAL BAIL AS A CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY. — The defendant was indicted for a criminal conspiracy to indemnify bail against the absconding of the prisoner. The jury found that the defendant, the bail, entered the agreement of indemnity innocently, with no intent to obstruct the administration of justice or to cause his principal to abscond. *Held*, that the defendant is guilty. *Rex v. Porter*, 26 T. L. R. 200 (Eng., Ct. Crim. App., Dec. 17, 1909). See NOTES, p. 560.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW — EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS — APPLICATION TO FOREIGN CORPORATIONS. — An Alabama statute taxed all foreign corporations on their capital stock. A corporation which had previously entered the state upon a compliance with certain statutory provisions, refused to pay this tax on the ground that it was not also levied on domestic corporations. *Held*, that the statute is unconstitutional. *Southern Railway Co. v. Green*, 30 Sup. Ct. 287. See NOTES, p. 549.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW — INTERSTATE COMMERCE — EXCLUSION OF THE LOCAL BUSINESS OF A FOREIGN CORPORATION ENGAGED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE. — A Kansas statute, among other stipulations, imposed a tax of a certain percentage of the capital stock on all foreign corporations seeking, or continuing to do, business within the state. For non-payment of this tax, it was sought to oust the local business of two foreign corporations that had been engaged for many years in both intrastate and interstate commerce within Kansas. *Held*, that the statute is unconstitutional. *The Western Union Co. v. Kansas*, 216 U. S. 1; *The Pullman Co. v. Kansas*, 216 U. S. 54. See NOTES, p. 549.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW — VESTED RIGHTS — REPEAL OF STATUTE GIVING RIGHT OF ACTION. — A statute allowed recovery from the city for damages consequent upon the grading of certain streets under eminent domain proceedings. The statute was repealed while the plaintiff's action was pending. *Held*, that the plaintiff cannot recover. *Ellor v. City of Tacoma*, 106 Pac. 478 (Wash.).